



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/611,522 | 06/30/2003 | Robert J. Friday | 6561/53768 | 4439 |
| 30505 | 7590 | 06/03/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| MARK J. SPOLYAR 38 FOUNTAIN ST. SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114 | | | CAO, HUEDUNG X | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2821 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EX

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/611,522 | Applicant(s) FRIDAY, ROBERT J. | |
| | Examiner Huedung X. Cao | Art Unit 2821 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LINDENMEIER (USP 6,768,457) in view of LINSAY et al. (USP 6,085,076).

As per claim 1, Lindenmeier teaches the claimed "apparatus for enhancing operation of wireless network environment, comprising "a plurality of directional antennas oriented about an axis, wherein the plurality of directional antennas have substantially non-overlapping patterns relative to each other, wherein the peak gains of the plurality of directional antennas are oriented about the axis and offset relative to each other at an angle substantially equal to $360/N$, where N is the number of directional antennas in the plurality of directional antennas; wherein the plurality of directional antennas are each operative to transducer a radio frequency signal and provide an output signal corresponding to the radio frequency signal" (Lindenmeier, column 9, lines 38-44);

a switch operatively connected to the plurality of antennas and operative to switch between the antennas in response to control signals (Lindenmeier, column 9, lines 32-37);

a detector operative to detect at least one signal attribute of the output signals provided by the directional antennas (Lindenmeier, Level testing devices 25); and

an antenna selection module operative, to provide control signals to the switch designating a selected directional antennas in the plurality of directional antennas, evaluate the respective output signals provided by the selected antennas, and select a directional antennas from the plurality of antennas for receiving the radio frequency signal associated with the wireless frame (Lindenmeier, column 13, lines 15-64). It is noted that Lindenmeier does not teach the selection is performed using the "preamble of a wireless frame". However, Lindsay teaches that such use of preamble in selection of received signals is well known (Lindsay, column 8, lines 40-50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Lindsay, to configure Lindenmeier's apparatus as claimed because the use of preamble in selection of signals increases the system efficiency and reduces the processing time.

Claim 2 adds into claim 1 "a radio module operatively connected to the switch for receiving output signals from one of the plurality of directional antennas selected by the antenna selection module" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 12, lines 22-57 in the OFDM signal modulation.

Claim 3 adds into claim 1 "the radio module is operative to demodulate the received output signals into digital data streams" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 13, lines 15-16 of the digital data.

Art Unit: 2821

Claim 4 adds into claim 2 "a data link control unit operative to process the digital data streams and identify frames from the digital data streams" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 10, lines 26-66.

Claim 5 adds into claim 4 "the antenna selection module is further operative to identify the selected directional antenna to the data link control unit, and wherein the identified frames include a source address, and wherein the data link control unit is operative to store the identified directional antenna in association with the source address in the frames in a data structure" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 12, line 22 to column 13, line 14.

Claim 6 adds into claim 5 "the data link control unit is operative to compose a frame for transmission to a destination, retrieve the antenna identifier associated with the destination address in the data structure, transmit control signals to the switch designating the retrieved antenna for use in transmitting the composed frame" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 13, lines 38-64.

Claim 7 adds into claim 5 "the data link control unit is operative to transmit a frame acknowledging the received frame" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to send an acknowledgement signal when received a frame because it reduces the confusion in signal transmission and increases the efficiency of communication.

Claim 8 adds into claim 7 that "the acknowledging frame is transmitted using the antenna selected to receive the frame," which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to send an acknowledgement signal when

Art Unit: 2821

received a frame using the selected antenna because it notifies the transmitter of the selected receiving antenna in signal transmission and increases the efficiency of communication.

Claims 9-11 add into claim 1 "at least one directional antenna is a patch antenna, a yagi antenna, and a parabolic antenna," respectively which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to use one of the patch, yagi, and parabolic antennas because it provides the efficiency for the system with its application matching the specific antenna type.

Claim 12 adds into claim 1 "the plurality of directional antennas is configured to maximize the coverage area provided by the plurality of antennas" which Lindenmeier teaches in column 4, lines 34-54.

Claim 13 adds into claim 1 "the plurality of directional antennas are configured to provide radio frequency coverage in all directions" which Lendenmeier teaches in column 5, lines 1-25.

Claim 14 adds into claim 1 "the switch, in a listen mode, is operative to switch between the directional antennas before a wireless frame is detected" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to have the switch performed during the listen mode because it reduces the processing time and increases the efficiency of transmission to a real time response.

Claims 15-19 claim a method based on the apparatus of claims 1-14; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason.

Claim 20 claims the apparatus of claim 1 using the orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) module (Lindenmeier, column 9, lines 48-56); therefore, it is rejected for the same reason.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that (A) Lindenmeier discloses a plurality of antennas where patterns overlap, but Applicant's invention discloses a plurality of directional antennas, oriented about an axis, having substantially non-overlapping antenna patterns. However, Applicant's claimed invention "substantially non-overlapping antenna patterns" implies that there's some overlap pattern in there. (B) neither Lindenmeier or Lindsay disclose or suggest a plurality of directional antennas wherein the peak gains of the plurality of antennas are offset relative to each other at an angle substantially equal to $360/N$, wherein N is the number of directional antennas. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. Specifically, Lindenmeier's discloses a number of individual antennas A1, A2, A3, in view of the required diversity of the reception signals 5 with an advantageously high degree of freedom and to evaluated each symbol, an optimal reception signal 5 is thus available at antenna connection point 21 on the input of receiver 3, which teaches applicant's claimed the peak gains of the plurality of antennas are offset relative to each other at an angle substantially equal to $360/N$ (Lindenmeier, column 9, lines 38-44). (C) Lindenmeier does not teach the system that minimize the overlap in antenna patterns by orienting the antennas about

Art Unit: 2821

an axis and directing the peak gains at angle intended to minimize antenna pattern overlap. The examiner disagrees with this assertion, Lindenmeier teaches by using multiple overlapping antenna patterns to maximize the probability of radio frequency over a given area teaches applicant's minimizing the overlap in antenna patterns by orienting the antennas about an axis and directing the peak gains at angle intended to minimize antenna pattern overlap (Lindenmeier, column , lines 38-44). (D) Lindenmeier teaches the selection directional antennas in the plurality of directional antennas, evaluate the respective output signals provided by the selected antennas, and select a directional antennas from the plurality of antennas for receiving the radio frequency signal associated with the wireless frame (Lindenmeier, column 13, lines 15-64).

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2821

Inquires

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huedung Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-1939.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong, can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huedung Cao
Patent Examiner


WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER